

INTERMODAL COUNCIL

Maryland Motor Truck Association, Inc.

3000 Washington Boulevard • Baltimore, Maryland 21230 Telephone (410) 644-4600 • Facsimile (410) 644-2537 http://members.aol.com/mmtanet

April 16, 1999

ORIGINAL

Docket Clerk U.S. DOT Dockets Room PL-40 1 400 Seventh Street, SW Washington, DC 20590-000 1

To Whom It May Concern: FtW # -96-3656-44/

The Maryland Motor Truck Association (MMTA) Inter-modal Council files these comments in response to the Federal Register Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPRM), Docket No. FHWA 98-3656, RIN 2125-AE40, regarding General Requirements Inspection, Repair and Maintenance, Intermodal Container Chassis and Trailers.

Jurisdiction

The jurisdiction of the Federal Highways encompasses areas which at first glance appear to cover only the trucking industry. A closer review of your jurisdiction describes railroads, steamship lines, pier operators and any other parties that own or lease intermodal commercial vehicles and thus are subject to the FHWA regulations. With this expanded jurisdiction of the railroads, steamship lines, etc., the question arises about the required Federal Department of Transportation (F.D.O.T.) number for this category of leased or owned vehicles, i.e. intermodal container chassis.

You have stated in your request for comments that you believe it is a joint responsibility between equipment providers, steamship lines, railroads and other parties. The fact that you consider anyone who owns or leases a commercial vehicle subject to the FHWA regulations opens the responsibility even wider.

Question 1

What is the out of service rate for inter-modal container chassis or trailers inspected?

Obviously, we in the trucking community do not have these facts or any of the additional questions in Question 1. The MMTA Intermodal Council has, through the cooperation of and an agreement with the Maryland State Police/Commercial Vehicle Enforcement Division and other law enforcement members, begun a special project in the state of Maryland.

Beginning April 1 through October 30, 1999, the law enforcement officers charged with the motor carrier inspection in Maryland will document through a Special Study Project Number 9902 (copy attached) to record all inspections that are given to the intermodal

container chassis. This special project should give some answers similar to the ones asked in questions 1, 2 and 4. The Maryland State Police have assured MMTA that at the end of the special study, we will be able to access the statistics achieved by this study.

Question 2

What is the violation rate (the average number of equipment-related violations of the FMCSRs found per inspection) for intermodal container chassis or trailers inspected at roadside?

Please see response to Question 1.

Question 3

Why does the Uniform Intermodal Interchange and Facilities Access Agreement disavow all responsibility for the fitness of intermodal equipment? Because in 1970/71 when the original Agreement was "negotiated" the U. S. Railroad Industry dictated what they wanted to the trucking and steamship companies and announced that this was the only Agreement they could live with and if they didn't get it they would embargo containerized freight.

Question 4

While we do not have data for this particular question, we do hope that the special study could be expanded throughout the country, which could give a better answer to Questions 1, 2 and 4.

Question 5

In the state of Maryland, whenever any type of motor vehicle violation occurs, the operator of the vehicle is charged as the defendant. Because the law does not allow a citation to be issued against a company, the driver is always burdened with the responsibilities of responding to any charges. We are aware that other states do allow corporations to be charged with violations that are usually attributed to the vehicle, i.e. equipment violations.

In reviewing this type of enforcement, many questions arise dealing with <u>container violations</u>. Who actually owns, leases, controls or is responsible for the container chassis? Most intermodal companies would love to see the responsible person for the trailer be charged with the violation. Many trailers are leased and the law enforcement officers are <u>not</u> sure who is responsible for the trailer's condition. However, the driver can supply the responsible company, steamship line, etc. Until Maryland law is changed, the drivers will continue to receive the citation.

Question 6

Should the party that tendered the intermodal vehicle be held responsible for all defects irrespective of the length of time?

Members of the MMTA Intermodal Council feel that the tender of the vehicle should always be held responsible. As most movements of the container are a one-time event,

usually one way, most operators only deal with that particular trailer one time, never to see or deal with the vehicle again.

Question 7

Problems with walk-around inspections.

As required in the Federal Department of Transportation 392.7, the operator is required to do a pre-trip inspection of his vehicle. Obvious defects which should have been observed, but were not corrected before entering the public highway, could cause the driver to receive a citation not only for the violation, but also for failure to do a pre-trip as required. Most drivers at inter-modal locations do have the time to do the walk around, but they cannot do other areas of inspection due to their limited resources, i.e., brake inspections, etc.

Question 8

The terminals at the Port of Baltimore have maintenance facilities and personnel. Because of the overwhelming number of trailers that pass through the port, many times the trailer is not inspected as required by the D. 0. T. Inspection stickers are placed on vehicles that may not really qualify, because port personnel do not care, because they do not have time, or it becomes an attitude problem. Many times, trailers that have an "out of service" decal placed on them have then removed by persons who need a trailer but don't care about the condition.

Question 9

The annual vehicle inspection that is required under Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulation Part 396.17 allows persons who control the trailers to mark or place stickers on the trailer denoting that the vehicle complies with the annual inspection requirements.

The major problem is that most trailers are registered in other states that may require the vehicle to be inspected in the home state. The state of Maryland has been given the authority to allow the use of the Maryland registration card as a document that acknowledges that the vehicle is in a required inspection program. The other serious problem is that a majority of the trailers do not have any inspection reports. In fact, keeping the registration secure is another problem for the driver as he changes trailers with every load.

Questions 10, 11 and 12

We are unable to respond to the questions. The statistics are not kept by enforcement personnel in Maryland.

Question 13

Could the safety objectives be accomplished with more frequent inspections with proof available within a day or two reference a D.O.T. audit?

With the trailers continually being moved about, the need for a six-month inspection time frame would help. The bigger question would be: Who would be the responsible party to

the more frequent inspection and who would maintain the forms if the D.O.T. requested them?

Question 14

What has the private sector done to resolve the problem of maintenance of inter-modal trailers?

In the Port of Baltimore, there are two chassis pool operations.

At Seagirt, there is a co-op pool involving four steamship lines. The program sounds good and could be a big help, but only if the steamship lines would allow them to manage the pool and make all of the repairs needed to make this equipment roadworthy. There are dollar limits that they can spend, which results in many chassis being out of service because the steamship lines will not ok the repair expenses.

The Dundalk chassis pool was started up prior to Seagirt and at this point only has three steamship lines. Again being managed by a private company but still must get approval from steamship lines for repairs and not enough chassis in the pool.

Chassis pools have a good concept, however, as long as the steamship lines hold the cost of repairs and do not provide good chassis for the pool, it will not work. Also, as you can see, not enough steamship lines participating.

Other than the chassis pool, there is no other action that the private sector can do to the steamship lines equipment. That is why all citations should be issued to the steamship lines on their equipment. Make them responsible and the problem will be solved.

It is MMTA Intermodal Council's position that the steamship companies and the railroad companies that own or lease this equipment must be held totally liable for the cost of any violations found at U.S. D.O.T. roadside exams. Then and only then will they be forced to perform the inspections and repairs of the chassis before mounting them with containers for delivery out of the terminal. Furthermore the trucking company should not sustain a notation on its safety record for these violations. If you desire further comment or explanation of our comments, we will be most happy to oblige.

Very truly yours,

Paul Kelly

Paul Kelly Chairman

Kelman Transportation P. 0. Box 432 Linthicum, MD 2 1090-0432

Tel: (4 10) 636-0473

cc: Sam Farruggio, Chairman ATA Intermodal Conference Thomas J. Malloy, Executive Director, ATA Intermodal Conference

901 ELKRIDGE LA LINTHICUM H (410)				711/		CVSA 2	4	P. 4/4			
MARYLAND MOTOR C MARYLANI 901 ELKRIDGE LA LINTHICUM H (410)			INSPECT	ON LOGATIO		LOCATIO	ON CO.	INSPR. CODE	CREW		
MARYLANI 901 ELKRIDGE LA LINTHICUM H (410)	ARRIER SAFETY PROC	RAM	1		İ	JUE	CODE				
LINTHICUM H (410)	STATE POLICE		WC) 						· -
(410)	NDING RD., SUITE 300		PANDO	ECT TYPE C	OF FACILITY FIXED		US DOT CEN	SUS NO.	STATE NO.	ICC S	اعور
	EIGHTS, MD 21090 694-6100		DÉFEC	T	ROADSIDE					- 1	
AME OF MOTOR CARRIER		•		DAESS			<u> </u>	CITY	STA	TE ZIP	
									20	HC AIP	
RIVER IDENTIFICATION					DRIVER'S LIC	THE N					OIO.
MARU INSULATION					DHIAGH 2 FIF	ense m	u.		485	EUED BY	eurt
LAST AME OF SHIPPER	FIRST		I ACTION IN	MIDDLE						TOUTE MO.	•
IAME OF SHIFTEH			SHIPPIN	IG PAPER NO	1			GO TANK D SPEC.	XCT EXEMP ("E" N	TION NO. FLEET	/INC.
							į	•		↓ F⁄	/1
COMMODITY TRANSPORTED		ORIGI					DI	STINATION		,	
			-	CITY	-		STATE	-	CITY		_
HAZARDOUS M	ATERIALS TRANSF	ORTE	0					IDENTIFIC			
	rision 4.1 CODE		EW?	UNIT 1	INIT		VERICE	IDENTIFA			
	rision 4.2			NO. T	INIT YPE YR.		MAKE	COMPANY	VQ.	LICENSE NO.	45
Division 1.3 Div	rision 4.3			1							
	vision 5:1	4		2		i			-		
	rision 5.2		 :			_			ــــ		
	rision 6.1			3							
	vision 6.2			4							
	es 7 Placar			<u> </u>							
	155 8 Require	d?	1 1	I lai	Type TD -	Shairte fi	huck TT = Th	and Travers C	T - Semi Tr	miler PT - Pole 1	متورا
Class 3 Class	158 9		- 1	O/I		_		-			
AAA A						ul Trailor	OC = Dolly		Mi = Que	OT - Other	
OOS DE A. REPAIRED AT SCENE	FECT VERIFICATION C. RESTRICTED SERVICE	INI Ce ili	UNIKNOWA	.	AXLE NO.	iT	<u> </u>	3			
B. TOWED/ESCORTED	D. OTHER			BRAKE					•		T
INSPECTOR'S SIGNATI	JAE DATE			PUSH	RIGHT]		j		1	ł
	UNI	pur	200	ROD		#===	_				#
Q.I VIOLATION IDE	NO	OF SVC	DEFECT VERIF.	BINUKE	LEFT			·			
				#							=
									-		
	1 1 1			 							
				-						<u> </u>	
1 1 2											
											_
	1 P I										
1 1 1											
ALCOHOLICONTROLLED	Y/N DRUG INTERD	ICTION	Y/N	DRUG INT	RDICTION	į NO.	SIZE AND	WEVELT	Y/N	TRADEIC	
		ICTION	Y/84	DRUG INTO	RDICTION	NO.	SIZE AND		YM	TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT	
SUBSTANCE TEST	DRUG INTERD SEARCH		Y/N	ARRESTS	ERDICTION Y/N			MENT	Y/N	ENFORCEMENT	
SUBSTANCE TEST	DRUG INTERD			ARRESTS			ENFORCE	MENT UNI	T NO.	ENFORCEMENT	
···	DRUG INTERD SEARCH	5.VS.A. (ARRESTS UED?			ENFORCE UNIT NO.	MENT UNI UNI		ENFORCEMENT Do not to	